

Date: Sat, 17 Apr 93 04:30:28 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #101
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 17 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 101

Today's Topics:

1500 watts too much? (3 msgs)
ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 17 Apr 93 00:05:45 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1384@arrl.org> zlau@arrl.org (Zack Lau) writes:
>Contrast that to say, 2 meter FM repeater controllers or antennas
>optimized for repeaters (down-tilt, anyone?). I don't see a lot
>of people devoting hundreds of hours to really great work--and
>then giving it away like some EME types.

I'm one of a team of folks developing a high-performance, multi-radio (up to 8
repeaters, links, or remote bases in any combination) repeater controller
based on the NEC V25 (8088-compatible, with extra goodies). It's a *LARGE*
project; the software alone has taken us well over 2 years of hard work, and
there's much more in sight. Quite aside from the issues of whether or not all
of the group's members would wish to give away that much hard work, there's
the small problem of size: there are four different PC boards, and over
30,000 lines of code, involved. That's much larger than a Yagi antenna design,
and wouldn't fit in less than about 6 QST articles... None of us are
interested at this time in doing it commercially, and the applications are

somewhat limited - but I don't know if we could bring ourselves to give it away anyway.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"If OS/2 is dead, then there are an awful lot of vocal ghosts calling us on
the phone." -- Katy Ansardi of Indelible Blue (an OS/2 exclusively store)

Date: 16 Apr 1993 23:28:08 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!inxs.concert.net!cole@ames.arpa
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr14.142107.8232@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:

>

>Last year all the media was ablaze over this study that had been done
>wherein it was claimed that children who lived and grew up near high tension
>power lines were more likely to get leukemia than those who did not.

Last year, nothing! I saw a report on ABC World News Tonight (with Peter Jennings) not last week. Must've taken up 10 minutes of the total newscast. Sad thing, too, because I was gearing up to approach the Association of Anal Retentives to put up a vertical. Guess not (depends upon who was watching it, though...)

Leave it to the sensationalist liberal media to spread fear to the ignorant. With the usual arrogant flair, the reporter used several examples and expert commentary to drive the audience into a veritable frenzy, then backed off at the end with the typical "we felt the public needed to know, we're just reporting the story, we're not saying this is the case, more tests are needed, don't be alarmed, BUT... This is so-and-so, ABC News."

What they forgot to mention, however, was that since the whole premise is based on so little information, children sitting 2 feet away from the TV during the newscast could be just as likely to become ill, but then that might mean fewer viewers. They also forgot to mention that in order to be relatively safe from most any harm via EMF, one must get rid of everything but the sleeper sofa and other non-radiating, inert household items. But that might also mean fewer viewers. Got to keep those viewers!

Not to mention (if it's not already clear) that 98% of the civilization of the entire planet is based/dependent upon EMF-producing devices!

Ranting, yes. Caring of children who come down with a simply horrible disease and would advocate anything to prevent it, definitely yes. However, I feel that education is warranted, not God-fearing hype and rhetoric. I honestly

believe that if that reporter had spent the same amount of time on the flip side of the argument (that there is indeed NO correlation, and that EMF is your friend), I could plant that vertical in the back yard with no trouble from anyone (and EVERYONE would live under power lines). The power of the mind-controlling media is utterly frightening. But we have set ourselves up, folks.

73 de KC4WEJ (off his soapbox for now),
Derrick

--

Queen to Bishop 6 check
Knight takes Queen
Bishop to King 7 checkmate
--

Date: Fri, 16 Apr 1993 02:39:01
From: seas.smu.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!FredGate@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

* In a message originally to All, David Adams said:
> Reply-To: dadams@cray.com
> In article 13799@n8emr.cmhnet.org, gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org (Gary
> Sanders) writes:
> |People also see a tower and antenna and assume the problem
> is
> |comming from there. I had problems with several neighbors
> even before
> |the tower had antennas on it. I had only 4 of 6 sections up
> when a
> |neighbor started complaing he was getting interference on
> his TV and
> |stereos. I had a heck of time trying to convince him that it
> wasnt me.
> |I was the only one with something visable he could blame.
> another neighbor
> |blamed me when her microwave stop working and for the
> lighting storms
> |in the area. I was "pulling in " storms with my antenna.

In a letter to Congressman Glenn English of Oklahoma, James D. Wells, Engineer in Charge of the Dallas office said:

JW:>Effective immediately, FCC field offices will no longer conduct
JW:>investigations of individual complaints of interference to

JW:>consumer electronics equipment. This new nationwide policy
JW:>will apply to all cases of interference affecting television
JW:>sets, VCRs, AM/FM radios, stereo equipment, telephone systems,
JW:>and all other consumer products. The policy also applies
JW:>regardless of the source of the interference, whether it be
JW:>electrical in origin or emanating from any kind of radio
JW:>transmission, either two-way or broadcast.

This was released in July, 1992. I reported on it at a Texas VHF-FM Society meeting in Austin, Texas in August, 1992. I am posting it here, today, April 15, 1993, after filing my tax return. Food for thought.

Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, N5GAR, Dallas, Texas
Confusion Research Center

* Origin: Com Port 1 - DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

Date: 17 Apr 93 00:08:26 GMT
From: ogicse!flop.ENGR.ORST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
wd6cmu@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Tom Blackwell (Tom.Blackwell@f7009.n124.z1.fidonet.org) wrote (quoting ARRL):
: "... It appears that the control operator
: of the station that first forwards communications from the
: originating station on behalf of the system is also in a good
: position to determine if those communications violate the rules and
: take corrective action where necessary. Therefore, in addition to
: holding the originating station licensee and control station
: operator accountable, we propose to add new Section 97.217 to the
: rules to also hold the control operator of the first forwarding
: station accountable for communications transmitted within a message
: forwarding system."

So what happens when everybody is running TCP/IP and the originating station *is* the first forwarding station in the system? Sounds like this is a quote from the old boy's club, where it is implied that the repeater owner inherently has a better sense of what is good operating practice than the repeater user. This model doesn't hold up in a modern digital network.

--
Eric Williams wd6cmu@netcom.com | Never attribute to malice that which
WD6CMU@WD6CMU.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA | is adequately explained by stupidity.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #101
